

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-5, and 7-23 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to clarify the invention, and claims 24-30 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Interview

Applicants' representative expresses appreciation for the personal interview granted by Examiner Vo on October 26, 2007. It was agreed in the interview that U.S. Patent No. 3,857,069 to Howell is not analogous art for the claims in the pending application. Accordingly, the rejections based on Howell will be withdrawn. Additionally, if a further Office Action is necessitated then it will be a non-final Office Action.

Claim Objection

Claim 29 has been cancelled, rendering the claim objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 16, 17, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,782,300 to Bonaccio (hereinafter "Bonaccio"). Applicant traverses this rejection based on the discussion below.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, recites a serial link transceiver with defect-detecting capability, including:

a differential transmitter configured for differential signal transmission;

a differential receiver configured to receive a differential signal from said differential transmitter;

first and second differential transmission lines coupled between differential receiver and the differential transmitter; and

wherein said differential receiver includes a monitoring system that detects a defect in one of the differential transmission lines, *said monitoring system determining said defect based on a common mode signal threshold detected in said differential signal received at said receiver.*

(See, claim 1, *emphasis added*)

Bonaccio does not teach each and every element of claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. For example, Bonaccio's detection means detects abnormal voltage and current variations at the *transmitter*, and not at the *differential receiver*, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. It is apparent that Bonaccio is concerned with transmitter detection because the comparators 34, 36 in FIG. 2 of Bonaccio are connected to the outputs of Odd and Even Data drivers 30, 32. (See, Bonaccio, FIG.2, col. 2, lines 55-60). In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 recites that the *monitoring system is incorporated in the differential receiver*, not the differential transmitter.

Applicant's claim 1 further recites that *said monitoring system determining said defect based on a common mode signal threshold detected in said differential signal received at said receiver*. This particular feature is not taught or disclosed by Bonaccio, nor does the Office Action suggest this.

Accordingly, based on the discussion above, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1, 2, 4, 10 11, 16, 17, and 19-21 be passed to allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 15, 18, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Bonaccio in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,176 to Paulos (hereinafter "Paulos"). Applicant traverses this rejection based on the discussion below.

Claims 3, 15, 18, and 22 depend from amended independent claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of *said monitoring system determining said defect based on a common mode signal threshold detected in said differential signal received at said receiver*. (See, claim 1) As discussed above, Bonaccio does not teach or suggest this feature. Further, Paulos does not cure the defects of Bonaccio. Therefore, the combination of Bonaccio and Paulo does not meet the requirements of prima facie obviousness for claim 1 or its dependent claims 3, 15, 18, or 22 because it does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. (See, MPEP 2143) Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of claims 3, 15, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and removed and that these claims be passed to allowance. Claims 24-27 have been canceled, rendering their rejection moot.

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, Claims 5-6, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonaccio in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,857,069 to Howell. Applicant traverses this rejection based on the discussion below.

As discussed in the interview, Howell is non-analogous art in reference to the pending claims, and therefore is not available for an obviousness combination.

Accordingly, as agreed in the interview, the rejections using Howell as a reference are to be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and removed and that this claim be passed to allowance. Claims 6, and 28-30 have been canceled.

At paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 7-9 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonaccio in view of Howell and further in view of Vadipour. Applicants traverse this rejection based on the discussion below.

Claims 7-9 and 12-14 depend from claim 1, which is allowable over Bonaccio for the reasons mentioned above. Howell is non-analogous art for the reasons mentioned in the interview, and therefore is not available for an obviousness combination.

Accordingly, as agreed in the interview, the rejections using Howell as a reference are to be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of claims 7-9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and removed and that these claims be passed to allowance.

It is further noted that Vadipour is directed at providing "high accuracy semiconductor device testing for high bandwidth applications while minimizing non-linear effects." (Vadipour, col. 2. lines 21-25) In other words, Vadipour is only concerned with measuring a common mode signal for the characterization of semiconductor device performance. Vadipour makes no mention of a *differential receiver includes a monitoring system that detects a defect in one of the differential transmission lines, said monitoring system determining said defect based on a common mode signal threshold detected in said differential signal received at said receiver*, as recited in claim 1.

Based on the discussion above, Applicants request that the rejections of claim 1-5, and 7-23 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that all of these claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 11/7/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600